

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-7 remain pending in the present application. Claim 1 has been amended. Claim 2 has been canceled. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Takano, et al. (JP 2001130245). Claim 2 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 2 depended from Claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 2 and Claim 2 has been canceled. Thus, Applicants believe Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 4 and 7, which ultimately depend from Claim 1, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takano, et al. in view of Inoue (U.S. Pat. No. 5,044,169). Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takano, et al. in view of Schnelle, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,611,374). Claims 3, 5 and 6 ultimately depend from Claim 1. As stated above, Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 2 and Claim 2 has

been canceled. Thus, Claims 3, 5 and 6 are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

Dated: December 15, 2004

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg